

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 10 are amended to improve form and new claim 17 is added. No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of amended claims 1 and 10 and new claim 17 are respectfully requested.

## STATUS OF CLAIMS

Original claims 1-16 are pending herein and new claim 17 has been added, accordingly, upon entry thereof, claims 1-17 will be pending herein.

## ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7, 9-14 AND 16 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Block et al. (US Pub. 2003/0050976)

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Block et al. relates to display control of a web site (community site) similarly to the present invention, particularly disclosing display of a personal web page, a team web page, and a league web page, which form a hierarchial structure, and access control to the respective web pages for a member or a nonmember. As the Examiner points out, Block et al. teaches registering personal information of a representative and information about respective members.

However, Block et al. does not teach the feature of claim 1 of the present invention, of "registering commodity information about commodities to be provided in a commodity database in association with the theme information" and that of claim 2, of "a commodity database in which commodity information about commodities to be provided is registered in association with the theme information".

The Examiner asserts that these features are disclosed in FIGS. 3, 4, 35 and 39 of Block et al. Applicant's respectfully submit that the Examiner errs in the above assertion. Particularly, Block et al. FIGS. 3 and 4 show an example of a personal web page (a web page of a player) and a web page of a team. However, these web pages merely display advertisements of commodities in some regions of the web page. The web pages in FIGS. 35 and 39 also show only advertisements of an automobile. Hence, what is displayed on these pages is completely different from a display of commodity information based on the theme information, as disclosed and claimed in the present invention (see FIGS. 9 and 11, discussed respectively at pages 15-16 and pages 18-19 of the present application).

Block et al. does not teach the feature of claims 1 and 2 of "extracting the commodity information from the commodity database based on the registered theme information". It follows that Block et al. does not disclose the feature of "transmitting the extracted commodity information to the terminal device".

The Examiner asserts that these features are disclosed in FIGS. 3-6 and paragraph [0034] of Block et al. To the contrary, the cited figures and paragraph merely disclose examples of structure and display of web sites (i.e., various web pages).

Thus, Block et al. does not teach the community site construction of the present invention which commodity information based on theme information of a community site is transmitted to a terminal device of a representative of the community site or a terminal device of a member of the community site. Block et al. does not include anything that corresponds to "theme information" of the present invention.

Independent claims 9-11 and 16 and the newly added method claim 17 set forth the same or similar recitations as claims 1 and 2 relative to features of the invention which are undisclosed by Block et al. and thus patentably distinguish thereover.

**ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8 and 15 for Obviousness UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Block et al. in view of Hunter et al. (US Pub. 2002/0095442)**

Claims 8 and 15 depend respectively from independent claims 1 and 12 which have been shown, in the foregoing, to distinguish over Block et al. Claims 8 and 15 inherit the patentable distinctions of their respective independent claims 1 and 12.

Moreover, Hunter et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Block et al. and is not even asserted in that posture.

Applicants further respectfully submit that prime facie obviousness of the combination of Hunter et al. with Block et al. has not been shown. Indeed, the contention of obviousness advanced by the Examiner for the combination, at page 16, is that the modification of Block by the teaching of Hunter et al. "... would enable the community site to be quickly and inexpensively in a two step method." The rationale is not understandable and the quoted statement appears to be incomplete, as set forth. While the Examiners' rationale for support of the combination appears to extend through page 17, it is not clear what the Examiner is asserting, throughout.

The contentions for the obviousness of the prior art combination, directed to claim 15 at pages 17-19, appear to be the same.

To the extent the Examiner's contentions are even understandable, it is respectfully submitted they do not meet the standards required under MPEP 2143-2143.03.

### Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims distinguish patentably over the references of record, taken in any proper combination,; further, there being no other objections or rejections, the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct. 15, 2004

By: [Signature]  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22312-1450 on 15 Oct, 2004  
By: [Signature]  
STAAS & HALSEY  
Date: 10/15/04